



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
MAYOR'S OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
JOSEPH A. CURTATONE
MAYOR

GEORGE J. PROAKIS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PLANNING DIVISION

STAFF

SARAH A. LEWIS, *DIRECTOR OF PLANNING*
DANIEL BARTMAN, *SENIOR PLANNER*
SARAH WHITE, *PLANNER / PRESERVATION PLANNER*
ALEX MELLO, *PLANNER*

MEMBERS

MICHAEL A. CAPUANO, *ESQ., CHAIR*
JOSEPH FAVALORO, *CLERK*
DOROTHY A. KELLY GAY
AMELIA ABOFF
GERARD AMARAL, *ALT*

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Visiting Nurses Association (VNA), 3rd Floor Community Room, 259 Lowell Street, Somerville, MA
Thursday, July 11, 2019
6:00 P.M.

New Cases to be Continued:

<u>176-182 Broadway (PB 2017-22) (Re-Advertisement)</u>	
Applicant:	Yihe Patsy's Corporation
Property Owner:	Yihe Patsy's Corporation
Agent:	Richard G. DiGirolamo
Legal Notice:	Applicant and Owner, Yihe Patsy's Corporation, seeks a Special Permit with Site Plan Review (SPSR) to construct a 26-unit mixed-use building with commercial space along the street frontage and residences above. CCD-55 zone. Ward 1.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	2018: 6/21, 8/23, 10/4, 11/8, 11/29, 12/13 2019: 1/9, 1/24, 2/7, 2/21, 3/7, 3/21, 4/4, 4/18, 5/2, 5/16, 6/6, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised)
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on June 20, 2019 to continue to July 11, 2019.
Minutes:	The Board voted to continue the case to August 8, 2019. The vote was 4-1. Joseph Favaloro opposed granting of a continuance.

<u>346 Somerville Avenue (PB 2019-08) (Re-Advertisement)</u>	
Applicant:	346 Somerville Avenue, LLC
Property Owner:	Palmac Realty Corp
Agent:	Richard G. DiGirolamo
Legal Notice:	Applicant, 346 Somerville Avenue, LLC, and Owner, Palmac Realty Corp, seek Special Permits and Special Permit with Site Plan Review (SPSR) to construct a 100-unit residential structure with inclusionary housing. SZO sections and articles including §4.4.1, §8.5, §7.11, Article 9, Article 13. CCD55 zone. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	3/7, 4/4, 4/18, 5/2, 5/16, 6/6, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised)
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on June 20, 2019 to continue to July 11, 2019.
Minutes:	The Board voted to continue the case to August 8, 2019.

<u>57 Broadway: (PB 2018-08) (Re-Advertisement)</u>	
Applicant:	Centrie Realty, LLC
Property Owner:	Centrie Realty, LLC
Agent:	Richard G. DiGirolamo
Legal Notice:	Applicant and Owner, Centrie Realty, LLC, seek Special Permits to alter a non-conforming property. The existing structure will be demolished and a new building with three residential units and ground floor retail will be constructed. Parking relief. Articles 4, 5, 7, 8, & 9 of the SZO. CCD45. Ward 1.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	5/2, 5/16, 6/6, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised)
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on June 20, 2019 to continue to July 11, 2019.
Minutes:	The Board voted to continue the case to August 8, 2019.

<u>365 Somerville Avenue: (PB 2018-08):</u>	
Applicant:	Nikhilsh Rao Goruknati
Property Owner:	Riggins Holdings, LLC
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Nikhilsh Rao Goruknati, and Property Owner, Riggins Holdings, LLC, seek special permits to convert from a café use to dentist office. Parking relief under Article 9. CCD-55. Ward 2
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	7/11
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	--
Minutes:	The Board voted to continue the case to August 8, 2019.

New Cases to be Heard:

10-50 Prospect Street (PB 2019-03) (Re-Advertisement)	
Applicant:	Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC
Property Owner:	The City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC and Owners, the City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority, seek Design & Site Plan Review under SZO §5.4 and SZO §6.8 to create an alley on Block D2 (as identified in the Union Square Revitalization Plan and the Union Square Neighborhood Plan) as proposed in the previously approved Coordinated Development Special Permit. TOD 100 and CCD 55-C underlying zoning district. Union Square Overlay District and CC7, HR, and MR4 sub districts. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	4/4, 4/18, 5/2, 5/16, 6/6, 6/13, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised)
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Voted on June 20, 2019 to continue to July 11, 2019.
Case Status:	Will be heard.

SLewis: update on conditions, had conversations talked in detail with Engineering and director of transport and infrastructure; Bennett court needs to have some truck traffic on it, the way truck movements happen, have to exit though Bennett and onto Prospect, have written a condition that timing can be adjusted, all building tenants will work with engineering and transport to limit timing to limit conflict as much as possible from d2 buildings and station area, other conditions make sure that cars leaving garage will not be allowed to turn onto Bennett Court, there will not be cars exiting onto Prospect Street, will all go to Somerville Ave which has lower traffic and can disperse more readily, won't know till permit, but intent of applicant and staff to make this a European style shared space, look more like open space of plaza than vehicular way, will be picky about specifications, appearance maintained to adequate degree

MCapuano: our anticipated use, from discussions a few weeks ago was that it be pedestrian friendly, that was what made us ask for it to be closed off for pedestrians for some time of the day, sounds like that is where we are

SLewis: it is also the entrance to D2.2 so from planning perspective, we need to be very aware about eliminating conflicts without hampering functionality

DKelly Gay: so what you are saying is that there will be hours of operation for loading

SLewis: can be time limits on trucks loading and unloading, still potential right in/right out of Prospect, but because of limit, will be no queuing, no stacking, no blocking

DBartman: in the Union Sq plan, at Bow Street, working toward that was learning that peak area movement for this kind of shared space was 200 vehicles or less per hour, peak hour is estimated to be slightly over, so by restricting to Somerville Ave will make this a comfortable space

MCapuano: talked about potentially putting up barricades outside of hours of operation, have looked at in this new version so can be used as pedestrian?

DBartman: discussed with Brad, he felt just by limiting vehicular access will achieve what we need, bollards are quite expensive, look at whether this could be managed, easier, more efficient to just limit

AAboff: intention for this to be used in higher traffic for ride hailing, still factored in

DBartman: one thing we can do is assign a drop-off spot, force to go to a certain location, had to lobby Google for mapping changes, would be similar type to that, until something like that is in place, they would be free to pull in, can work on that, have not instigated work with Uber/Lyft yet

SLewis: to be clear, that will only be right in, right out

DBartman: concerned about right turn for bus lane, we are in control of turning movements on our right of way, looking into issue with city engineer, considering our options

MCapuano: we discussed making that not a pick up spot

DBartman: we don't disagree, part of function for buildings is that each should have a designated drop off, but that's where staff stopped with pursuit of this issue, we can control traffic coming out,

DKelly Gay: have real concern with drop off/pick up, they don't obey rules now why will they start?, won't be any different here, who will police this?

DBartman: if you get assigned spot with Uber/Lyft, it will force driver to go to location unless people waive them to side of the street, the app will try to force this, its only thing company can control

MCapuano: pick up and drop off would be for residents, how many units?

DBartman: 87

MCapuano: there won't be that many, actually, and if I go, I won't be plugging in Bennett Court, will be using the address, did we do in Davis?

DBartman: we did do this for some places, could pursue a spot here

SLewis: economic development confirms that we do this in Davis

MCapuano: it's a good idea to pursue, concern is mitigated by the fact that only people who will plug in is those who live or visit there, will be reduced by having pick up/drop off, what staff has done has addressed a lot of concerns about cut through, not a pedestrian way though pedestrians will be there, will allow some vehicle traffic for loading/unloading

GKarczewski: appreciate conversation, agree with sentiment of ensuring pedestrian priority but need to be sure that that both buildings can function as intended, because of dedicated bus and bike lanes, not a lot of drop off locations, need to be very intentional about that space, some specific ideas in conditions, will work with staff to work out best way to handle this to balance goals we've discussed, whether solution is exactly the same or not, will take work to make out

AAboff: not allowing left into Bennett Court, but allow left to Prospect?

SLewis: only right in, right out, no left turns permitted

In Favor:

· Scott Hayman SCC is on record, testimony delivered support letter, looked at all goals, housing and other needs, spent long time looking at amenities near t stops, wanted to look at possibility for more greenspace, significant difference about where green space is placed, and future allow for greenspace once MBTA lot is finished, just want to get on record, approve moving forward, think that the window can close, great project, excited about passage of CBA in principle

- Meredith Levy SCC underscore agreement goal is to integrate support for all pieces, looking forward to affordable housing, celebrate CBA, supportive of D2 in general 2.4 specifically, all projects unleash opportunity to get affordable housing needed, we really prioritize, will continue to support, time is important, people getting displaced every day, war of timing, so more housing in first phase the better, support green space

Opposition/Concern:

- Jacob Kramer on design of alley, mixed message looking like plaza but having vehicles, especially trucks, may be confusing, bollards are needed, condition that if there is fatality, will trigger a significant redesign, trucks making corners is how someone died in porter square, may be very dangerous

- Wig Zamore: really opposed to whole design of D2, including alley and placement of open space, start with draft zoning, high rise to circle residential, no integration of design, don't do 50 to 100 plan and presume that will remain low rise, have the opportunity to have this act as keystone for whole square, if you screw up the keystone the arch will collapse in rubble, if you do it right, will be foundation for long term,

- Tori Antonino: agrees with previous speaker. Thinks a park should go where the alley is proposed.

SLewis: reminder that alley goes back to being established as an alley from the neighborhood plan, Allen Street neighbors chose not to participate in the planning process, planning staff watched carefully what happened in that area, Milk Alley is created as a midblock passage so both sides can benefit, without trying to further burden Allen Street with curb cuts, parking, consideration of what could happen in long run to Allen Street benefits for having a front/back when properties are developed, have infrastructure to benefit them in the future

MCapuano: regarding the use of Charleston Place, talk briefly about how cul de sac could be used, all have concerns about people walking, how to restrict cut throughs, maximize use

DBartman – required by MBTA so that ride vehicle can reach within 100 feet of stop, not built to fit tractor trailer so none will be on Charlestown Place, only way to leave is for trucks to leave via Charlestown street, in short term Bennett is stopgap, turn around area is designed to look like plaza, conditioned to respond to how temp turn around at city hall is working <laughter> and that's because it's not working well

SLewis: with construction of high school, small turn around was set up in front of City Hall that didn't work well, DPW painted turnaround in that area, it got a little better, but not enough to direct cars around well

DBartman; interest was in having paving design direct people around that circle, but box trucks need to be able to drive over to access loading dock, design needs to achieve multiple points, based on watching cars not being able to navigate in front of our office, but this will have way less traffic, some about drop off for T, but navigating down there will be more annoying than to just let off on Somerville or Prospect to get to the station, the most traffic will be MBTA paratransit service

MCapuano: Jacob's point is good, something that can be left open, protective bollards, staff is not on board yet, concerned with traffic and trucks, can add a condition to revisit if it becomes a safety or use concern, intent of Board is for it to be as pedestrian friendly as possible without making it unusable, could direct not to use bollards at outset, but do we have capacity to revisit? look what happened in front of west Somerville school, don't want to have to go down that route, would prefer to have the appropriate condition in place

SLewis: hear what you are saying, will need conversation with brad and engineering, can add condition that says contingent on mobility and engineering directors that will be studied further? from planning and zoning perspective, don't want to add anything that will hamper traffic flow, should consider now, contingent on fatality is not what anyone wants, but need the right people to make this determination is crucial, will consider further

JFavaloro: the key part is to make it retractable, put in at start, discussion of when up or not can happen later, retractable by nature is flexible, this is opportunity to have developer put it in, use restriction and timing is determined later by traffic and planning, further study not enough

AAboff: since bollards are originally my fault, I understand that there are also the possibility of removable, not retractable, could be physically removed twice a day, not as aesthetically pleasing, but there are technical solutions that don't require expense

MCapitano: in Harvard Sq, make use of planter boxes that stop traffic

AAboff: as discussed, can add condition to have it studied, space is needed for function of building, if director says that this is not/should not be pedestrian, should be open to that it could go either way

DKelly Gay: safety is highest priority, don't wait to make the changes, hadn't thought about this, these are relatively small spaces, something to consider, like idea of something that is removable, not permanent, understand buildings have needs, have to look at it a little deeper

DBartman: question for application, some about of dirt removal, what depth are you going to now? For powered have to go down 66 inches, for manual only 36 in depth, 72' for foundation under that, some digging no matter what

GKarczewski: seeking to minimize excavation to bare min, only going to sub grade of road at this time, utilities on either side, will consult with traffic engineer to understand implications, future, allow flexibility in either direction good

MCapitano: condition of figuring out what can work while being concerned with safety

SLewis: will investigate with applicant and director of mobility, what type of bollard that could be installed, retractable or removable, don't want to open too much digging with tainted soil on site

MCapitano: don't want go down too far

GKarczewski: we want to explore if bollards make sense, and if then what kind, need transport experts to weigh in

AAboff: is there something we can use as estimate for volume of ride hailing, also, is Bennett Court suitable for emergency vehicles

DBartman: transport access plan shows ability of emergency vehicles to pull in, fire dept desires access on two sides, alley on both sides, would be concern if there was a permanent bollard, need access on 2 sides

MCapitano: reiterate condition text

SLewis - applicant team will work with director of mobility and with engineering to understand the traffic flow, timing, necessity of bollards on Bennett Court, if Mobility/engineering says that this is not advisable, will that be okay?

MCapitano: I'd be okay, prefer it but understand and prioritize safety

AAboff: need the ability to revisit in the future

MCapitano: not sure if we can

DKelly Gay: if bollards are not feasible, can't go against that, but until we have that direction, can't make the decision

MCapuano: move to accept as conditioned and amended

JFavaloro: understand D2.1 life sciences building, hoped others could be bundled together, alley moved the ball forward, I'm not sure that they are ready, this isn't just an alley, it serves all other elements

MCapuano: Alley does serve not just the two parcels we are going to hear from next but D2.1 and the MBTA and handles general mobility throughout the site. Will raise those concerns on other aspects of the site. Thinks it appropriate to move forward on it tonight as condition.

Motion seconded by AAboff. Vote is 3-1. JFavaloro voting no.

10 Prospect Street (PB 2019-04) (Re-Advertisement)	
Applicant:	Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC
Property Owner:	The City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC and Owners, the City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority, seek Design & Site Plan Review under SZO §5.4 and SZO §6.8 to construct a commercial building on Block D2 (as identified in the Union Square Revitalization Plan and the Union Square Neighborhood Plan) as proposed in the previously approved Coordinated Development Special Permit. TOD 100 underlying zoning district. Union Square Overlay District and CC7 sub district. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	4/4, 4/18, 5/2, 5/16, 6/6, 6/13, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised)
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	The Board voted unanimously 4-0 to accept the Staff Recommendation as conditioned and amended to approve the request for Design and Site Plan Review.

Greg Karczewski, President to open presentation. Listened to comments from board and staff, John Sullivan here from architect to respond.

JSullivan: to address thoughtful feedback from board regarding facade, articulation, expression, celebration of entrance

top

- looked at care to step massing down, had a good dialog with staff to craft building at upper levels, maintain what we feel strongly about for design, looked at treatments of upper two levels to define as top, still with design in spirit and language to have recognition in that vocab

change allow glass at those levels to read differently as punched openings

base

give more appropriate sale, very helpful to look at how to make the base celebrated, lifted base, increase transparency of glass to celebrate retail use, storefronts raise to level 2 datum, give base presence to support, elevating and give more presence

entry

looked closely at building entrance, this is a major building, deserves importance, focus attention here to make building better, originally set entry canopy at 12 feet, simply articulated, steel and glass, raised canopy up to datum of 15 feet for more prominence, still protective but more significant, paid attention to materiality to give better sense of scale with cross braces, new frame, active, more modern, helpful, feel it has improved selection

MCapuano: will reserve comments till after, will take testimony after each one separately

In Favor:

- Steve Mackey – Somerville Chamber of Commerce; so many have been working toward this for upwards of a generation, seen Boston and Cambridge become world centers, national leaders for life sciences, bio tech, this building will be like none other that we have, above all achievements, huge addition to community, believe that developer has been sensitive to and responsive to comments in neighborhood, planning department and board, hope this is ready to be approved and celebrated, hope to move forward

- Carpenter's union representative, union carpenters in favor of seeing jobs

- Wig Zamore: agree with Mackey that this is an important use, need to balance housing with jobs, this will help, design is fine, always and still concerned about d2 on that site
- Jessica Eshleman, USQ Main Streets in favor of 2.1 in particular, jobs and foot traffic will bring to patronize local biz, another biz closed so start soon

Opposition/Concern:

- Tori Antonino: appreciative of commercial, general support, but don't see any green infrastructure and engineering, pity, physics working in our favor, low impact development here could use physics and gravity instead of raised beds with irrigation, study came out that says we will save water and energy and health if we focus on sustainability, should not have raised beds on sidewalks, need bio swales need all plants like those I've brought, this is not enough, should not be irrigating, told that blue roof can't be used to irrigate plants, because the water gets too hot, at rate of which it goes down won't it cool in time? why store it if not to be used, would like improvements before this is passed.

SLewis: applicant has worked with us extensively, listened to comments, and done a good amount of work so that we recommend can conditional approval because of all the work done so far; conditions no longer about design because we have worked through it all

DBartman: take note that city is obligated by master land agreement to improve streetscape, we're in the middle of an RFP, because of that the applicant won't be able to plant at street, mobility will be pursuing a plan at the intersection, space will be limited, plan is to figure out how to achieve protected intersection, City will take responsibility for it, will be cycle track or our work

MCapuano: applicant has done a fantastic job in translating what board and neighborhood have asked for, have some work still to go but with this design applicant have done what we were hoping to see, little concerning to hear about sidewalk but very happy to hear where you are today, thanks for working with us to get this where it is, building is sorely needed, very much in support of this

JFavaloro: concur, emphasize that only piece I support is the life sciences building, long awaited, for all arguments we've heard, this is the one that everyone has gotten around to yes with, will take each component as standalones, this is the one shot at my support, I see work you've done, improves on so many levels, many concerns were around losing people to other cities and towns, funds needed by city contingent on this first critical piece, hoping that when we get to a vote you hear to my concessions so that we can get to other blocks

DKelly Gay: agree with both Michael and Joe on this building, needed to see something that wowed me, this does that, was concerned about getting shovels in the ground, know the pressure that is on, but we can't go for just anything, this had to be extra special, you've really listened, great ideas, this is going to be spectacular, I'm in favor, listened to what tori said, but this could be our issue, we can work together to make this best for everybody, will work to make this what we need it to be, aware that there is a lot of envy around Somerville, people asking "how'd you do it?", we can do it because everyone takes part, neighbors, council, this is how it's done. home run

AAboff: everyone was nice, now I have to be difficult, appreciate the effort shown, I've engaged more recently, crux of community feedback came back to desire for open space and environmental performance, proximity of traffic to building, solving for air quality is not your problem but it encouraged me to dig deeper into LEED schedule for points, obligation for certifying that design meets LEED, very little wiggle room with some points in maybe column, there are 15 gained on location alone, only 5 on energy performance, want to hear more about those decisions, is there room to nudge on optional or otherwise to put obligation in place for LEED recertification in three years to ensure that certification is maintained

GKarczewski: appreciate concern and interest in sustainability in general, will work on parallel paths, MEPA process concluded on June 28th, did lot of energy modeling and energy performance work, especially on glass to make the space marketable/permeable but also provide good energy performance, this proposal is to stretch code, under version 4 worked to meet standards, when we go for build permit will be required to recertify, will move maybes to yes, some things we are working on this round - blue roof, committed to purchasing 100% clean energy, as responsible as we can be

MCapuano: appreciate all you have done to get to where we are, this is the critically important first step to increasing infrastructure and tax base, focal point for USQ, appreciate what you have done to make this what it is, do hope that we get more maybes moved to yeses

AAboff: still hoping for an answer about commitment to recertification

GKarczewski: way LEED works is we design to meet needs at this point, will certify at building permit, at that point not a need for ongoing certification because it's not an operating standard, not sure what will achieve, have taken steps to certify that we have delivered what we promised

DBartman: zoning technically requires LEED approved project to prove at each stage is certifiable, so if there is a change have to prove again, and again at each later stage, before certificate of occupancy, doesn't have to prove that they are actually certified, could require that they actually apply, since zoning only makes them prove that it can be compliant

AAboff: not certifiable until a year of performance data is in, this could be a valuable condition to add

MCapuano: as we all know, certifiable is greatest thing to be, move to accept staff as conditioned and amended, seconded by DKelly Gay, 4 to 0 in favor

<u>20 Prospect Street (PB 2019-06) (Re-Advertisement)</u>	
Applicant:	Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC
Property Owner:	The City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC and Owners, the City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority, seek Design & Site Plan Review under SZO §5.4 and SZO §6.8 to construct a general building and a Special Permit under SZO §6.8.10.A.4 to authorize a principal entrance for ground floor residential uses oriented toward a side lot line. TOD 100 underlying zoning district. Union Square Overlay District and High-Rise sub district. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised)
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Voted on June 20, 2019 to continue to July 11, 2019.
Case Status:	Will be heard.

Staff summary/SLewis: general building, still some pieces that we are working through with applicants, based on board comments, conditions in staff report that explain conditions, still outstanding issues to be addressed, have reached agreement between us and applicant, rear of building where zoning appears to require look of two buildings that butt against each other, wrote conditions for how it wraps, looks contiguous unto itself, minimize garage level, part of conditions there

Working with condition to make sure height of storefront becomes suitable for height of building, venting within storefront area of building, how affects base of building, ties into fascia/sign band,

Coming to back, potentially elements when buildings are against each other, height variation, some architectural element at cornice to differentiate, beside architectural style, not limited but made some suggestions

Residential entrance on Bennett court needs visibility and grandeur as entrance to homes

If board was ready to vote this evening, those were written so that applicant could keep working with staff

MCapuano: usually very happy to allow condition when small details to work out, to allow applicant to work with staff, far too much unseen and unproven here, need to leave a lot of the building to staff, not in keeping with this

board, not ready to move forward with that much open, not sure how much public testimony as there will be another in a few weeks,

DBartman: also case with next, both are seeking discretionary permits, separate special permit to approve or it will not be compliant, seeking vote on that in advance, could choose to address that separately, no improvement in front of you, but could vote, code wants all entrances to be off front of the building, but this could be good, advantageous to have storefronts on the front, could move forward to pursue that, to make their application fully compliant

MCapuano: they can move forward on design and present something that is compliant, but we will vote to allow them to move with entry on Bennett Court, open for testimony but will have new presentation on August 8th

In Favor:

· None

Opposition/Concern:

· Neighborhood council rep – we’ve seen front, don’t see back, don’t see inside, even on Bennett court, where are loading docks, what happening inside, stores, why use Bennett court?

· Tori Antonino - concern about both is that they are weak on sustainability and green infrastructure, US2 doing passive house on another building, why not for this site, will only take 8 years for passive house to reap back extra cost, should consider standards for all these sites if cost benefit is that good, not enough in overlay, push envelope in staff comments, only pushing for 60 points

· Wig Zamore – need to have meetings with boards or a model in front of us, confusing to talk about this without, certainly enough produced to have things before the public to remind which building we are talking about, LEED has been around a long time, even more true for passive house, law of land is International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) 2018, MA has fully adopted, one of only two in country, requires air filtration because they are so tight, start looking at MERV 16, thicker, lower pressure drop per inch even with much higher filtration, think lower number is cheaper but ineffective and energy consuming

MCapuano: will continue discussion to August 8th, second the request for some kind of location map/plan/model

GKarczewski: will be happy to do

MCapuano: going to do one vote for design something with entrance to Bennett Court, one vote for building

AAboff: is side entry likely to change in further design work?

DBartman: not, staff supportive of location on Bennett Court

JFavaloro: don’t want to take any vote tonight

MCapuano: this vote only authorizes that they will be able to present something to us, not authorizing the building, just the entry movement to Bennett Court, it’s a technicality but one that is needed to move forward, will take up actual design later

In Favor:

· None

Opposition/Concern:

- None

MCapuano made a motion to vote only on special permit with principle entry on side lot line. Seconded by DKelly Gay. 4 - 0 in favor

50 Prospect Street (PB 2019-07) (Re-Advertisement)	
Applicant:	Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC
Property Owner:	The City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC and Owners, the City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority, seek Design & Site Plan Review under SZO §5.4 and SZO §6.8 to construct a mid-rise podium tower building and a Special Permit under SZO §6.8.10.A.5 to authorize a 5% increase to the dimensions permitted for the point tower of the building. TOD 100 underlying zoning district. Union Square Overlay District and High-Rise sub district. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised)
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Voted on June 20, 2019 to continue to July 11, 2019.
Case Status:	Will be heard.

MCapuano: this project has similar issues, with new staff report, staff intro

DBartman: these are similar, design section is the variable, looking to adjust dimensions of tower itself by up to 5%, working with building code on stairwells, changes to accommodate, has inflections, all that comes with special permit request for dimensionally compliant to proceed,

MCapuano: as with door, this is minor, technicality that requires special permit

In Favor:

· none

Opposition/Concern:

· None

MCapuano motion to approve SP to allow a 5% increase. Seconded by DKelly Gay. 4 - 0 in favor

MCapuano: application for building itself not before us tonight, applicant will come to us with amended plan and design

SLewis: issues we are dealing with; concerns regarded rear of building, main item is that definition of a podium tower requires a base with tower above, articulation needs to be developed as it wraps to back of the building, had looked like D2.2 wrapped into D2.3, where they butt together at hypothetical lot line, expected to look as if designed by two different architects at different times, looking at how these become podium and look like D2.3 as it wraps, facing the T and to Milk Alley, looking to make sure the intent of the zoning is met back there

MCapuano: will take testimony on the understanding that we will take testimony again in august

In Favor:

· None

Opposition/Concern:

· Jacob Kramer - appreciate the work that goes into this, have a lot of concern more broadly about blocking of these buildings, have to do with how the entire thing is laid out, the heart of project needs to be reexamined, esp as what things go where

MCapitano moved to continue the application to the August 8th meeting. Seconded by AAboff. 4-0

10-50 Prospect Street (PB 2019-05) (Re-Advertisement)	
Applicant:	Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC
Property Owner:	The City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant, Union Square RELP Master Developer LLC and Owners, the City of Somerville and the Somerville Redevelopment Authority, seek Design & Site Plan Review under SZO §5.4 and SZO §6.8 to construct a Plaza civic space type. TOD100 underlying zoning district. Union Square Overlay District and High-Rise sub district. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised)
Staff Recommendation:	None at this time.
PB Action:	Voted on June 20, 2019 to continue to July 11, 2019.
Case Status:	Will be heard.

Shauna Gillies-Smith / Ground Inc.

Thanks for tenacity, will speak about d2 civic space only

Overall is in range of 33k sf, civic 21k sf range

Model is not entirely up to date, but helps to visualize, at CDSP, plaza was raised to Prospect Street, from train grade up, almost 15 foot difference, working with staff, lowered to level of the T, to create accessible plaza and use metaphor of river edge, as project progressed, building shrank, moved around, civic space increased by about 4% to 21k sf from 15k

Work best when we find poetic metaphor first that relates to history of site, researching we learned about Miller's River through the site, not literally, but metaphor, worked well with sloping riverbank idea, conceptually and in reality, flow of pedestrians to entrance of new GLX station, as well as to neighborhood to east, but also eddies, moments of pause along this flow, want to accommodate people running to T at last minute, but also place to pull off and rest, know that it is safer when more people stop and occupy space

Location for elevator, working with city and MBTA on that at point of highest level change, also a stair that flares to seating steps, wait for train or enjoy sunshine, along edge is green bank for buffer, river carries into way we treat paving and path to T entrance, widest area, outdoor room, will include infrastructure for art or performance flexible space, then more green area, zone associated with T, designated art component, working with them to articulate entrance, ride drop off with entrance, locations for storage bays for trains, eddies, pockets of casual seating, moveable chairs, can see Prospect Hill monument as you get off the train

How big is space? glad board asked for the comparison, was useful exercise, hard to understand less you compare to what you know

Davis Sq plaza is 13k sf, 175 x 97 feet;

Smith center in Harvard square, 5,400 sf, 110 x 50 feet

Relation to street/traffic?

In future design of Prospect Street, 2 way street with 11 foot travel lane, then bike lane, then dedicated bus lane, then sidewalk of 5 feet, green buffer is 21 feet, plaza 116 feet

Flow with pockets, lots of different uses scattered across the park, want to have lots of people so that the space will feel safe even late at night when people are returning home

700 linear feet of seating, diverse types with locations for mobility devices, shade trees, predominantly native, in order to ensure that they grow to maturity, will provide plenty of soil volume, paving surface at least 70% permeable

Public art framework to provide power, sculpture anchor spots

Two routes for connection to neighborhoods, north south, east west

MCapuano: looks very nice, good use of native plants, one of concerns people have is air quality between road and this plaza, lot of green space, but how much does that block pollution?

SGillies-Smith: that's why sections to gain idea of what real dimensions are

GKarczewski: had a lot of conversations, in this instance, pollution impact, 3 point strategy

- Vertical separation with cars above at higher grade
- Horizontal separation with depth away

There is also a lush space a ways away from this space

MCapuano: appreciate overlay of other spaces, a lot bigger than I thought it was, bigger than two examples, didn't think there was that much space

JFavaloro: heard clearly about location of plaza, trying to think of other spaces where there is that much of a buffer, can't think of others

AAboff: Dan mentioned earlier about changes to edge of right of way and bike lanes, how does condition being presented differ from what you presented

DBartman: at D2.1 where bike lane would have to go onto sidewalk, no change would happen here unless the bike lane would move to be closer to sidewalk

DKelly Gay: pleased because was imagining traffic was closer, changed my view of whole thing, much bigger than thought it was, still concerned because there will be traffic, and traffic standing, very pleased with presentation

AAboff – are trees going to be allowed to grow to full height? Could block line of site to commercial space, was concern voiced by team against community plans

GKarczewski: planting plan is the one we commit to, worked closely with staff to locate all so they can grow to their full height, no sense that the corner will be disadvantaged versus other things

MCapuano: how do you envision space in winter with snow,

GKarczewski: shauna will shovel... will likely tent off an area, particularly in front of retail to place, will need to keep snow clear

SGillies-Smith: snow melts on permeable paving much faster, will drain down, way that we have planned to use light in benches, will help keep plaza bright and comfortable

DBartman: similar to how others were handled, leave open to have time to respond to comments

Standard written to sections for trees that would be 30 feet or higher, dirt not to be compacted, in collaboration with Green and Open Somerville have list of 130 trees that could be selected, normally trees planted based on salt tolerance, have expanded the range of criteria, trees selected are high on the ranking

In Favor:

- None

Opposition/Concern:

- John Springfield - half and half, like connection to existing, would like view from station looking at garage, SCC not here now but hope that open space don't preclude health center,
- Michelle Hanson - those trees aren't going to suck up what is coming off prospect, not sure how to change but not buying particulate will be taken up
- Jacob Kramer - air pollution appreciate that different forms of separation, mindful of eddies will be in terms of pollution also, could end up with recirculation, need to see how air is supposed to flow through space, will subject to more pollution, will be extra load of new cars, probably low estimate, community has said loud and clear, this is a way to get a to b but not to spend time, places to spend time are too close to street, look at community proposal, consider what kind of public space people want to be in
- Neighborhood council member, plaza should not be on Prospect Street, will be bad, all storefronts in other places are against the streets, there are no plazas downtown
- Tori Antonino - concerned about juxtaposition about plaza to road, setback is not making a difference, sunken will be more particulates? Real danger to us, in order to have a reason to deny have to cause intractable harm to people who use it, knowing what we know, this will put people at risk, might not want plaza in this place, align buildings to put plaza in interior, where is low impact, green design, why irrigated, just not true that native trees can't handle salt, want to go over planting plan, natives are robust and hardy, I want to be involved, will take you on tour of our spaces
- Wig Zamore: plaza should be in center of block, building walls concentrate pollution, 100 meters is extreme danger, as you bring walls in, concentrate pollution, no chance this will not be highly polluted, time you least want people in this space (morning and rush hour) is the time you will have most people in there, standard for green wall is that if you can see light, you're not blocking particles with the green wall, not going to be enough, Shauna is great designer, made a great choice, have legal obligation not to preclude getting to porter square, so however people travel to this space, make sure this works as written

MCapuano: keep written open till 26th at noon, will take up again on August 8th with staff report

<u>337 Somerville Avenue (PB 2016-09-R1-3/19) (Re-Advertisement)</u>	
Applicant:	BwB – Square
Property Owner:	GNJ Real Estate Holdings, LLC
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant BwB – Square & Owner GNJ Real Estate Holdings, LLC seek revision to special permit 2016-116 to revise conditions. NB & CCD 55 zones. Ward 2.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised)
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Voted on June 20, 2019 to continue to July 11, 2019.
Minutes:	<p>(Gamaral recused and left the room)</p> <p>no applicant</p> <p>request to extend opening time, revision of condition imposed when originally approved to keep outdoor activity open till 11 at brewery,</p> <p>MCapuano: open to discussion of the Board</p> <p>JFavaloro, assume no issues?</p> <p>SLewis: staff is not aware of any</p> <p>MCapuano: what were hours approved for comedy club?</p> <p>SLewis: midnight on friday/sat</p> <p>MCapuano: given that, don't see issue for 11</p> <p>In Favor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · none <p>Opposition/Concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · none <p>DKelly Gay: no problems with revision, don't seem to be issues, have visited, found it well attended, think this is a good idea</p> <p>MCapuano motioned to accept staff recommendation</p> <p>4 to 0 in favor</p>

<u>114-120 Broadway: (PB 2019-13) (Re-Advertisement)</u>	
Applicant:	Goodfood Restaurant Group, LLC
Property Owner:	Goodfood Restaurant Group, LLC
Agent:	Sean O'Donovan
Legal Notice:	Applicant and Owner, Goodfood Restaurant Group, LLC, seek a Special Permit with Site Plan Review (SPSR) under §5.2 of the SZO to replace a one-story building with a 5-story mixed-use building (+/- 4,000square feet ground floor retail and 39 residential units on floors 2-5). Inclusionary units provided under Article 13of the SZO and parking relief under article 9 of the SZO. CCD45. Ward 1.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	5/16, 6/6, 6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised)
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Voted on June 20, 2019 to continue to July 11, 2019.

Sean O'Donovan on behalf of applicant, architect stuck in traffic

Was before board three years ago for same location, worked with neighborhood but project didn't go forward because they wanted building next door to change L shape of the project. Successful in buying new site, submittal presented is increase in same style 39 units, retail expanded, 4000 sf, special permit request only, relief requested is under code (parking) but same program, just a bit bigger. Similar mix of units, 7.8 affordable (.8 for trust fund). East

Somerville Main Streets in support not only of design but also of increase in program. Councilor at neighborhood meeting, in support of project (architect not arrived yet)

MCapuano: so, it's exactly the same, just bigger, more units, etc.

SO'Donovan: staff has been helpful, had favorable vote last time at PB, aldermen were uneasy based on concerns of neighbors, abutters now on board, easement has been worked out, looking forward to moving forward, likely to break ground for winter,

MCapuano: when will architect be here?

SO'Donovan: on the way but not yet, could go through plans without him

MCapuano: could go through discussion but public comment won't be useful without presentation

SO'Donovan: not sure if many people are here, neighborhood meeting was so successful that it was not seen as necessary

MCapuano: going to open for questions, open for comments and leave open for written feedback

DKelly Gay: not many questions, would like to have architect, happy to hear about neighborhood meetings, some were concerned about the back but that neighbor may have moved

SO'Donovan: correct, onsite meeting about 30 people, went well, positively received

JFavaloro: first, appreciate that heard concerns and appreciated reluctant approval but kept working at the piece that all were concerned about, don't always get someone as willing to put all approvals on hold to try to get more concerns handled

would like when architect comes to do a side by side of what it looked like

MCapuano: agree

JFavaloro: want to see it clearly

SO'Donovan: just not here yet, we heard you loud and clear, was not easy but worked hard

MCapuano: want to echo other comments, you had approval before but glad to see you moved forward with what your neighborhood wanted

AAboff: about the condition regarding green roof on building, what is the plan, would this be included in landscape plan?

SO'Donovan: I think yes, but that's a better question for architect

AAboff: what is the envisioned retail use for commercial space?

SO'Donovan: don't have one right now, what we learned is that the neighborhood wanted the 4,000 SF space to become two smaller spaces for more local shops, stimulate neighborhood, no big box uses

GAmaral: what is the placement of mechanicals? neighborhood happy with setback?

SO'Donovan: no objections or concerns voiced at meetings

GAmaral: there were some concerns at beginning

SO'Donovan: were some concerns with electrical at city, that was location determined to be ideal

In Favor:

- Jen Atwood East Somerville Main Streets – supported at the board and DRC, have reviewed and in support of this project, note especially that we're happy to see that incorporating 3 beds in design, happy they corrected L shape feedback, happy to see project move forward, lower Broadway can further develop

- Gus, abutter 112 - full support of construction, have owned for many years, since returned from service in 73, very big change from past, used to deal with prostitutes, drunks, already seen improvement, this project will enhance not just area but criminal activity will change, lot of professionals in area, need uses to support them, keep wanting them to move forward, hope gets done soon, newer faces don't want to see mess, want to move on, be transitioning, need not just immigrants but younger professionals, will be better for everyone, will help business too, have full support hope city will do best to move on it

Opposition/Concern:



· none

SLewis: transformer has been there since original approval, that came from electrical inspector and EverSource needing it to have visible access, unfortunately limited in the planting can go in front, original condition had it screened to max allowed, that condition continues landscape area generally does not include roof but it may be included in pervious surface area.

MCapuano: architect not here yet? will leave comment open till Friday August 2nd at noon, expect you to reappear on 8th; make sure renderings are here.

60 Cross Street East/240 Mystic Avenue/771 McGrath Highway (PB 2014-31-R1-5/19) (Re-Advertisement)	
Applicant:	Anthony D. Galluccio
Property Owner:	Young Lee
Agent:	N/A
Legal Notice:	Applicant Anthony D. Galluccio and owner Young Lee are filing to revise facades from the original plans approved by PB 2014-31. Original approval was to construct an approx. 107,597 sf 3-story residential building with 75 units and approx. 100 parking spaces located under the structure. No other revisions or changes requested. Zone BA / PUD-B Ward 1.
Date(s) of Hearing(s):	6/20, 7/11 (re-advertised)
Staff Recommendation:	Conditional approval
PB Action:	Voted on June 20, 2019 to continue to July 11, 2019.
Case Status:	Will be heard.

Anthony Galluccio for applicant

Minor revisions to project garage structure, was not fully designed, complications with grade with respect to windows and doors, some windows and access doors needed to be moved, worked through many issues with staff, consistent materials to make staff happy, coming to make sure that final plan is acceptable to board, 65% complete, waiting for approval to finish, ownership project, what the neighborhood really wanted, strong response, will market to Somerville residents expect occupancy in jan 2020, townhomes for residential

Plan to renovate Chuckie Harris park, intended to be more passive park, lot of trees to offset air quality, worked with neighbors/abutters, to make more passive park

Elevations, series of many minor adjustments

JFavaloro: What took so long?

AGalluccio: ownership project, not as easy to finance construction of condos, also encountered some environmental conditions unexpected and challenging, can't do anything but apologize

MCapuano: one issue we've had with other applicants is alignment of windows, good to see renderings of passive park, nice design

AGalluccio: spent a lot of time with these neighbors, started with 150 units, was maybe too big, board made the project better, McLaughlin is okay with revisions, had at least one neighborhood meeting, well received, didn't want a lot of activity outside their windows, will share security information to help keep an eye on the park, has been an issue, are concerned about safety

MCapuano: appreciate the explanation for why we are here again

In Favor:

· Tori Antonino, will speak in favor, excited about park, wonderful design, 100% ownership, relief to have developer who is responsive and excited, like the energy, nice when we can all get behind a project, congratulations

Opposition/Concern:

· None

MCapuano: yes, Tori, lot of history to this project, DKelly Gay as mayor, JFavaloro as alderman, sticking point was what neighborhood wanted, make ownership, uphill issue for applicant, came through and did the work, client and team has been nothing but cooperative and supportive

AGalluccio: we made a commitment to finish, pb and community pushed on a lot of levels, committed to 10% 3 beds, learned a lot, was a challenging vote for board, hpe to deliver very quickly,

DKelly Gay - delighted about park, know what that was at one point, bane of neighborhood, terrific plan, happy to neighborhood enjoy it, felt wounds for the stop and shop, but neighbors are happy now, park I'm thrilled about

SLewis - when we realized discrepancies, this team was patient to work with, esp with regard to what de minimus plans require, any one update would have been but with all of them, applicant was good to move forward, and go through the process

JFavaloro: will vote in affirmative, was opposed to this project, was major condition out of stop and shop for this to be commercial, that was not what occurred, glad to get things for neighborhood wanted, not in favor of this but voting for it

MCapuano moved to accept staff recommendation, seconded by DKelly Gay, 5 to 0 in favor

Other Business

There was no other business.

NOTICE: While reasonable efforts have been made to assure the accuracy of the data provided in these minutes, do not rely on this information as the complete and accurate portrayal of the events in the meeting without first checking with the Planning Division staff. If any discrepancies exist, the decisions filed by the Board serve as the relevant record for each case. The Planning Division also maintains audio recordings of most Board meetings that are available upon request.